



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/641,431	08/18/2000	Russell A. Wilson	INTL-0434-US (P9442)	6667

7590

03/03/2003

Timothy N Trop
Trop Pruner & Hu PC
Suite 100
8554 Katy Freeway
Houston, TX 77024

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SM.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/641,431	Applicant(s) WILSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Le Nguyen	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 58 of fig. 7. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 7-13, 17-23 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365).

As per claim 1, Tang teaches a method comprising displaying a communications interface in association with a window (figs. 3, 5, and 8), the interface including an icon representing a potential object recipient (figs. 3 and 8; *object recipient 21 and 14 respectively*), and enabling an object to be transferred to the recipient by dragging-and-dropping a representation of the object to the icon (figs. 3 and 5; col. 8, lines 36-38).

Claims 11, 21 and 29 are individually similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 2, Tang teaches a method of providing an icon for each of a plurality of users and enabling communications through the communication interface between the users (figs. 3, 5, and 8; icons such as “Julie” and “Susan” communicating via communication interfaces).

Claims 12, 23 and 30 are individually similar in scope to claim 2 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 3, Tang teaches a method of providing a home interface for the users and enabling communications between the users and the home interface using the communications interface (*figs. 3, 5, and 8 and respective portions of the specification*).

Claims 13 and 25 are individually similar in scope to claim 3 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 7 and 8, Tang teaches a method of providing an interface for preparing notes to be transferred from the interface to the communication interface (fig. 3; col. 8, lines 35-37 and fig. 5; col. 9, lines 37-50).

Claims 17-18 in combination is similar in scope to the combination of claims 7-8 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 9, Tang teaches a method of providing an interface for preparing notes having the appearance of sticky notes (fig. 1; col. 8, lines 52-54).

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 9 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 10, Tang teaches a method of providing a first interface where objects are persistently stored after being transferred from the first interface (fig. 5; *objects 26 are stored in interface 24*) and supports operations to delete objects (col. 11, lines 58-59). Tang does not explicitly disclose a second interface where objects are automatically discarded after being transferred from the second interface. Hogan teaches a first interface where objects are stored (fig. 12; *object sharing window 82*) and a second interface where objects are automatically discarded after being transferred (col. 8, lines 35-38; *such as the case wherein text strings are transferred in a drag and drop operation*).

Claims 20 and 28 are individually similar in scope to claim 10 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, Tang teaches a system that includes a display and a mouse coupled to the processor (fig. 10).

As per claim 24, Tang teaches a system wherein the storage stores instruction that enable the processor to facilitate communications between users of the same system (fig. 5 and respective portions of the specification).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 14 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365) in view of de Hond (US 5,796,395).

As per claim 4, Tang teaches a method of providing access to interfaces, associated with a user, on a user-selected or user initiated basis (col. 8, lines 3-5; col. 10, lines 35-36). Tang does not explicitly disclose providing access to an interface on a password basis. De Hond teaches a method of providing access to interfaces, associated with a user, on a password basis (col. 4, lines 43-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include De Hond's teaching of providing access to interfaces on a password basis to Tang's teaching of providing access to interfaces on a user initiated basis in order to provide users with a more secure environment.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365) in view of Screen Dumps of Microsoft Word 2000 ("MS Word").

As per claim 5, Tang teaches a method of depicting miniature version of objects/images a.k.a. thumbnails (figs. 3, 5, and 8). Tang does not explicitly disclose the thumbnails of the objects to be produced when the object is mouse clicked on. MS Word teaches producing a thumbnail depiction of an object when the object is mouse clicked on (figs. 2-3; *object 200, when clicked on with cursor 210, produces a thumbnail depiction 300 of the object as in fig. 3*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of producing a thumbnail as taught by MS Word to Tang's teaching of the use of thumbnails in order to maximize the display area available.

Art Unit: 2174

Claims 15 and 26 are individually similar in scope to claim 5 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 6, MS Word teaches a method of attaching a depiction of the object to a cursor so that the depiction moves as the cursor moves (figs. 3-4; *object is attached to a cursor in fig. 3 and moved as displayed in fig. 4*).

Claims 16 and 27 are individually similar in scope to claim 4 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Memhard et al. (US 6,201,859 B1) teach a method and apparatus for controlling participant input in a conferencing environment.

Tang et al. (US 6,349,327 B1) teach a system and method enabling awareness of others working on similar tasks in a computer work environment.

Shearer et al. (US 5,579,521) teach a conversion of data and objects across classes in an object management system.

Baumgartner et al. (US 5,195,086) teach a multiple call control method in a multimedia conferencing system.

Carey et al. (US 5,821,925) teach a collaborative work environment supporting three-dimensional objects and multiple remote participants.

Art Unit: 2174

Hamada et al. (US 6,191,807 B1) teach a communication apparatus and method for performing a file transfer operation.

England (US 6,144,991) teaches a system and method for managing interactions between users in a browser-based telecommunications network.

Ludwig et al. (US 6,212,547 B1) teach a UTP based video and data conferencing.

Namikata et al. (US 5,949,414) teach a window control with side conversation and main conference layers.

Dawson (US 6,252,588 B1) teaches a method and apparatus for providing an audio visual e-mail system.

Fernandes (US 6,014,135) teaches a collaboration centric document processing environment using an information centric visual user interface and information presentation method.

Morris et al. (US 6,097,389) teach methods and apparatuses for presenting a collection of digital media in a media container.

Chang et al. (US 5,428,729) teach a system and method for computer aided software engineering.

Beard et al. (US 5,867,156) teach automatic viewport display synchronization during application sharing.

Treibitz et al. (US 6,091,408) teach a method for presenting information units on multiple presentation units.

Art Unit: 2174

Inquires

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-7601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Lê Nguyen
Patent Examiner
February 21, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100